G. R. S. 59]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1908.
(Murgai)

File No. 36 - 08

Serial Nos. 164

Papers Filed.

Month March 1911

SUBJECT.

Petn of Puttasamiah of H
in the Kadur Taluk, reducing
of the assessment recovered on
Jodi village of Hoguehalli belong
to Basaguni Math

PREVIOUS REFERENCES.

Misc 34 - 1900

LATER REFERENCES:

GPB—

G.R.S. 11] 1908-9

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

(Nuznai)

NOTES

File No. 36-08

FILL HEADING.

Refund of the excess amount recovered as assessment over the poor imposed on the Village of Hagrehalli in the Kadur Taluk endowed as Inam to Basappa Mall

From

Valmeatdar Puttasamiah,

~~No~~ Petition Dated 29 Sept^r 1908 Received

Diary No. 39	Enclos	Spare Copies	Serial No. 1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER

Prays for the refund of the excess amount,

NOTES AND ORDERS

2 To, The Dy. Commr, Kadur Dist
C. M. No 81 Dy 19 10 08
Forwards 81 for report with a request to be informed of the exact amount recovered as excess.

NOTES—First sheet

GPB—15,000—24 1 09

G. 3, S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 36 of 1908

Serial No.

To, Puttaswamiah,
Inst no 82 Dy 19 10 08
Instructs the above,

3 From the Dy Comm'r, Kadur Dist
Letter no 110 Dy 7 12 1910
Relative reports called for in Rl

The previous references are hereunto submitted Attention is respectfully invited to G O no 4473-4 Dy 15th April 1908 on the Bisagna matt

7(1)(a)) In the first para of this order, it is stated that by some mistake, the lands in Hogrehalli were shown in the Village accounts as kandayam lands in the khata of "Hogrekhan mathada Siddeswara Devaru" subject to the payment of an assessment of one Rupee per acre The Dy Comm'r reported that the lands belonging to the Hogrekhan khan matt, a branch of the Bisagna matt in the Chickmagalur Tq, had been entered as Inam to the Hogrekhan matt and necessary corrections made in the Village accounts The lands of the matt measuring ~~of~~ 76-4 and assessed at R, 76-8-0 are enumerated in the margin of the order,

Note - Contn sheet

GPB—20 000—12-8-10

G. O. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 35 of 1907

Serial No.

Puttasamiah, Vahivatdar of the Bisagnia matt, pet^d Govt praying for the refund of the excess amount recovered as assessment over the jodi imposed on Hagrehalli Village. The petition was forwarded to the Dy. Commr and that officer was requested to intimate the exact amount of such excess. The Dy. Commr has now reported on the matter.

The Inam Supdt has written to the Dy Commr stating that the Quit-rent to be imposed is 1/4 of Rs 76-8-0 or Rs 19-12-0 or Rs 19 avoiding fractions. The Dy. Commr reports that a sum of Rs 1374 excluding the Local cess has been recovered as Kandayam from the year 1888-9 to 1905-6 and that deducting 1/4th of the above amount as jodi as per Inam Supdt's letter, a sum of Rs 103 5/8 has been recovered in excess of the jodi due to Govt. It is reported that the amount recovered prior to 1888-9 cannot could not be ascertained, as no recds. are forthcoming in the Taluk office relating to such recovery

Submitted for orders

BVC(32) RL
7.1.1911

Sanction for the remitted sum is accorded

7/1/1911

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—12-10-07

G. & S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 36 of 1908

Serial No.

Submitted for orders
AVC(132)
10/1911

Upon a perusal of file No. 34 of 1900 that was herewith sent to me I find that everything depends upon the interpretation of the Sanad of 1884.

In his petition of 1900 the Venkatadri prayed for the management of the Hoskote Taluk and Land being also assigned by Sanad. He did not say that was known - The Collector in his letter said Letter No. 3310/S 29.8.1900 Said "and the resumption of the Land in Hoskote was apparently allowed to stand" In this office docket No. 1483 of 13.1.1903 it was pointed out that the Sanad of 1884 made Hoskote also an Inam Village. In subsequent correspondence this has been taken to be true.

The Sanad of 1884 is not quite clear - Was it quite clear Mr B.G. Krishna Iyengar would not have said "and the resumption of the Land in Hoskote was apparently allowed to stand" and the order would not have remained unenforced and the Pensn would not have remained paid. It seems to me that every body interpreted the order as referring to Kolar only so far as the Bijapur Taluk was concerned.

To understand what the intention of Sanad was it is necessary to see the original file relating

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—12-8-10

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 36 of 1908

10 · 1

6

7

Serial No.

to this Order of 1884

If that should prove that this order violates of facts we have to make Hoyrehaki also an Inam the next point for consideration is whether in the circumstances of this case a refund is necessary.

As already stated all parties seem to have interpreted this order of 1884 as referring to Kolgaon only the Govt did not complain at all and even in the petition of 1908 there is no contention that this Village is Inam and that any portion of Kolgaon has been levied - It has now been discovered that Hoyrehaki is also an Inam (assuming for the present that this interpretation is correct) The error may be rectified with prospective effect and not with retrospective effect.

Obtain for reference the file of 1884.

10/1/14

The file of 1884 received from the Genl records is herewith ~~submitted~~ returned for kind perusal

Submitted to Dewan Bahadur Lead Commr

Submitted DK 1323 28/1/1911

The file of 1884 and this other papers put up with it do not make it possible to ascertain whether Hoyrehaki was also understood to be an Inam.

Note—Contn sheet.

GPB—5,000—27-4-07

Serial No.

framed as known. There are no office notes showing [illegible] concerning the rules of which Darwan or others

Seeing that even in a subsequent order the [illegible] mentioned will be strictly observed we may take it that it was intended to enforce [illegible] as soon. Mr. [illegible] Hospitalities was known. This view can be the objection is to being unknown

(G O No 4173-4/100 Dt 15th/7th August 1908)

As regards refer 2 the Hospitalities can be seen Minute Papers re [illegible] Colonel about the Kolgari Lands between this Govt and the Baba Bandan Range; and this Govt have objected above Hospitalities As a rule should when this Govt opened their eyes only after the Magistrate pointed out to him that Hospitalities was also known. In this connection the Hospitalities Lands by Govt this entry as it is this reminder from the Govt, and by that he is the assumption of the management of Native Lands by Govt. I do not see now this Hospitalities Govt can use in a large sum from Govt or what respect Govt will mean

NOTE.—Contn sheet.

GPB—55,000—27-4-09

(7

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 36 of 1908

Serial No.	
	[illegible]
	[illegible]
	20.1.1911
1359.	I am inclined to agree that the order of 1884 is not clear about the Hogrehalli lands being entered as inam with a jodi of 4 As in the rupee. The Dy C~ however considered that the omission was a mistake and ordered ~~its~~ the conversion of these lands to inam tenure R in 1905, and this was approved by Govt in the order of 15-4-1908 (Z) We cannot now question the correctness of this conversion.
	Strictly speaking, I believe we should refund the excess collections. The matter however should be examined also in the Rev. Dept if an order of rev

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—55,0 10—27-4-0v

~~fund is to be passed.~~) But taking into Consideration that the order of 1884 Contemplated the grant of the inam Concession for the purpose of maintaining the Inam institn Concerned properly and that neither the Govt nor the Parties interested thought that the order ~~Concerned~~ Covered these lands, and that the institn Concerned has not Spent the amount of the value of this Concession, ~~the~~ Govt may decline to recognise the character of the inam till it was actually so entered in the Govt accts in 1905. On this ground, the refund may be refused.

Note.—Contn. sheet.

GPB—55,0 9—27-4-0s

25/11/11

Serial No.

Transferred - Branch I for disposal
By order
Asst Secretary.
9/11/08

From the Dy Commrs report no 469 dated the 2d march 1905, it is clear that the order of 1884 was not applied to the Hogrehalli lands till the years 1905-06, and that the ryots to whom the lands had been leased out, were paying to the Mattha and temple at Hogrehalli a gutta of 5 seers for every maund of coffee produced in the lands, which was being utilized to meet the cost of maintenance of the institutions. The affairs of the institutions were being managed badly by the persons then in charge, and no accounts were kept of receipts and expenditure. The institutions were in no way made to suffer on account of the loss of 3/4 ths of the assessment on the lands. Further, there was no scale of expenditure prescribed till

Note—Contn sheet

GPB—55,000—27-1-09

Serial No.

1908. For these reasons, it is a matter for orders whether it is necessary to refund the difference between the full assessment and the quit-rent.

23-4
21/2/1911

2/2/11 From the order of 1886, it is clear that the claim of the petitioner to any mirasi was not ~~having been established beyond a~~ recognized as ~~of right and the~~ The treatment of Kolyari as an mirasi village of the petitioner was ordered only as a concession on account of the ~~mirasdars~~ and antiquity of the institution which had been enjoying its mirasi for some time. The order does not direct the restoration of the Koyetalli village explicitly and the inference that the resumption of the village and the consequences arising therefrom remained unaffected till it was again ordered to be treated as mirasi in 1908 seems to be correct. There seems to be no ground therefore to refund the difference between the full assessment already received and the quit-rent that has been

Note— Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—12 8 10

Serial No.

subsequently hired. The purpose moreover for which this amount would have been appropriated, if it had been incurred every year viz the current expenditure in the hostel having been otherwise satisfied there is still less reason for further protracting (censuring) the institution - 2 B V 11

3/2/11

95 Submitted to Dewan Aiyar
4/2/94

10037/7.2.11 A brief history of the case is not available. Hence the Government cannot form their judgment as to what may be done - [No alternate reasoning is called for]

Submitted
Perused and
seen by the Hon'ble
Minister
8/
24/2/1911

515 Submitted to Executive Council
24/2/94

GPB—50,000— 12 8 10

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 36 of 1908 1094

Serial No.	
1545	Draft- attd. by 2nd Councillor Issue and return file attached for reference. 23 2.11 1/3/1911
	Ref file retd. as ordered 7-3-1911
4	To - Pt Hasanieh (Patna) No 2303 of 15. 3. 11 Informs that Govt see no proper reasons for sanctioning the Refund asked for
	To - The Dy Comr Kadar Dist No 2304 of 15. 3. 11 Forwards copy of the above with Refee to dl 3.

NOTE—Contn sheet.

GPB—50,00 ›—12 8 10

Rec no 3608-1

D6221

Refer
G.A.

7/10/08
by
29/9/1008

To,

The Secretary to the Government of
H H the Maharaja of Mysore,
Revenue Department.

Sir,

I, (Puttasamiah Tahsildar of Bisagani Mutt and its Branch Mutt at Hogrehally in the Kadur Taluk) beg to request the favour of ordering the refund of assessment levied on lands situated at Hogrehally between the years 1884 to 1906 as on a perusal of Government Order No 710-11 dated 28th April 1884 and also your office letter No 855 dated 13th August 1905 to the Deputy Commissioner Kadur District, it will be seen that through oversight the lands which should have been assigned as Inam was not recognised as such the result being that these Institutions were maintained with the greatest difficulty during this period and the benifits from lands which should have properly accrued to them have been credited to Government

I beg therefore that

such benifits as the Government may think fit the refund of the amount minus the jodi that has now ~~fixed~~ been fixed may kindly be ordered to be refunded for the period for which full assessment has been levied

I beg to remain

Respected Sir

Your most obedient Servant

[illegible]

Vahivatdar.

29. 9. 08.

3

Muz.3]

GOVT. OF H. H. THE MAHARAJA
OF MYSORE.

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

No. 81
7L 36-08-2

The accompanying Petition No. 39,
dated 29th Sept. 1908, received at this
Office from Puttusamiah, Vahivatdar
of the Bisagnia matt, in the Chikmagalur
Taluk, praying for the refund of the
excess amount recovered as assessment
over the jodi imposed on the village
of Hogehalli in the Kadur Taluk en-
dowed as inam to the matt for the
~~is forwarded, together with its~~
enclosures, to the
period for which fresh assessment
was levied, is forwarded to the
Deputy Commissioner, Kadur Dt.
in continuation of Govt. P.O: No. 4473-4,
dated 15th April 1908, with a request that
the exact amount of such excess
received ~~by~~ from the matt may be
intimated to this office at an early
date.

By Order,

16.10.1908

BANGALORE,
19-10-1908

for Secretary,
Muzrai Department.

GP.—1500—20-10-07

Mrs D 10

Draft for approval

Murrai

L

Endorsement granted 04

Puttusamiah, Vatwadar of a

Busapura matt, Chickmagalur

taluk, with reference to his petn

Regd no. 39, dated 29th September

1908, praying for the refund of the

excess amount recovered from the

matt as assessment over the

land ~~of the~~ ~~encroached~~ village on the

~~by the encroachers~~ village of Hosahalli

in the Kadur taluk endowed as

inam in favor of the Instn.

In reply, the petitioner is

informed that his petn has

been forwarded to the Deputy

Commissioner, Kadur District,

for report

By order,

16-10-1908

for Secretary

to Government

Jmr 2) 10

~~D 2375~~ 3.36

190 SR 2.

3104

From

The Deputy Commissioner,

Kadur District,

To

The Secretary to Govt,

Gen & Rev Departments,

Dated Bangalore.
7-12-10.

Despatched

Received

General No. 220
No.

Enclosure No. 1 + 1 file

Reporting on the petition of Puttaswamia Wanivatdar (now deceased of the Bisagni Watt in the Chikmaglur Taluk, praying for the refund of the excess amount recovered as Jodi.

Communicate this to the Petr
17/12/1910

12/12/10

GPB—75 reams—25.5.10

5

Deputy Commissioner's Office, Kadur District,

Dated, Chikmaglur, 7th December 1910.

From

K.R.Srinivasa Iyengar, Esquire, M.A.,

Deputy Commissioner,

Kadur District.

To

C.S.Balasundaram Iyer, Esquire, B.A.,

Offg Secretary to the Government of Mysore

General & Revenue Departments,

Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to your Official Memo No 81/F.L. 36-08-1, dated 29th-9-08, forwarding petition of Puttaswamia, Vanivetdar(now deceased)of the Basagni Mutt in the Chikmaglur Taluk praying for the refund of the excess amount recovered as assessment over the Jodi imposed on the Village of Hogrehalli in the Kadur Taluk, endowed as Inam to the Matt, for the period for which the full assessment was levied, I have the honour to state that it is reported that a sum of Rs.1469-9-0(including the local cess), or Rs.1377/- (excluding the local cess) has been recovered from the ryots of the Matt from the year 1888-89 to 1905-06 towards the assessment on the above lands, the amount recovered prior to the year 1888-89 not being ascertainable as no references are forth-coming in the Taluk Office, relating to such recovery. Deducting $\frac{1}{4}$ of the above amount as Jodi as per Inam Superintendents letter No 125 dated, 24/25-3-06(copy enclosed for ready reference)a sum of Rs.1035/-has been recovered in excess of the Jodi due to Govt since the year 1888-89.

2. The vernacular records bearing on the subject are herewith submitted for favour of reference.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Deputy Commissioner and Dt

6

No 125. Inam Superintends Office,

Dated, Bangalore, 24/25-3-08.

From

The Superintendent of Inam Settlements,

in Mysore,

To

The Deputy Commissioner,

Kadur District.

Sir,

In reply to your letter No 1213, dated 6/7-3-08, furnishing the details of the actual extent, assessment, &c of the lands in Hogrenalli Village, Kadur Taluk, belonging to the Risagni Matt in the Chikmaglur Taluk, and requesting to be informed of the actual amount of quit rent to be levied, I have the honour to state that as per Para 5 of the Govt. Proceedings No. 710-11/7, dated the 28th April 1904, the quit rent to be imposed is ¼ of Rupees 76-6-0, or Rs. 19-2-0, or Rupees 19/- avoiding fractions.

I have &c,

Sd/ D. Shama Rao,

Superintendent of Inam Settlements,

in Mysore.

"COPY."

J. Chamaraja

for Deputy Commissioner,

Kadur District.

GKK.

With reference to his petition praying for a refund of the assessment levied between 1884 and 1906 on the lands at Hoffenhalli belonging to Hoffenhalli matt on the ground that in accordance with G. O. No. 710-11 dated 28th April 1884, the lands are to be treated as inam on one fourth quit-rent, Puttaswamiah, Valuvattidar of Basapur matt and its Branch matt at Hoffenhalli in the Hadur Taluk is informed that Govt see no proper reasons for sanctioning the refund asked for.

By Order,

Off

2/1/911

for off: S

23/2/11

P.T.S

No 2304 Empfile Dy 15/2/11.
Imr 36-08-4

Copy to Deputy Commissioner, Kadun District, with reference to his letter No. 220 dated 7th December 1910.

2. The Kannada papers received with the above Comm. are returned herewith

By Order,
Dy 22/2/1911
for Offg Secy